



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/032,326

12/31/2001

Yukio Sawajiri

SAWAJIRI=2

4583

1444 7590 01/16/2009  
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
624 NINTH STREET, NW  
SUITE 300  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303

EXAMINER

LUGO, CARLOS

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3673

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/16/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING  
2  
3 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
4

5  
6 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
7 AND INTERFERENCES  
8

9  
10 Ex parte YUKIO SAWAJIRI, HIROYUKI SAKAGAMI,  
11 and MIKI OGINO  
12

13  
14 Appeal 2007-2479  
15 Application 10/032,326  
16 Technology Center 3600  
17

18  
19 Oral Hearing Held: August 12, 2008  
20  
21

22  
23 Before WILLIAM F. PATE, III, JENNIFER D. BAHR, and JOSEPH A.  
24 FISCHETTI, Administrative Patent Judges  
25

26  
27 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT:  
28

29 NORMAN J. LATKER, ESQUIRE  
30 Browdy & Neimark, P.L.L.C.  
31 624 Ninth Street, NW  
32 Suite 300  
33 Washington, DC 20001-5303  
34

35 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday, August  
36 12, 2008, commencing at 1:00 p.m., at the U.S. Patent and Trademark  
37 Office, 600 Dulany Street, 9th Floor, Hearing Room A, Alexandria,  
38 Virginia, before Lori B. Allen, Notary Public.

PROCEEDINGS

JUDGE PATE: This is a hearing conducted pursuant to 37 CFR 41.47, in Hearing Room A, on August 12, 2008, at one o'clock. Judge Pate is presiding, and the other judges are Judge Fischetti and Judge Bahr. We're going to go off the record.

(Off the Record.)

JUDGE PATE: Just step up to the podium there, sir, and make yourself comfortable.

MR. LATKER: Thank you for giving me your time today.

JUDGE PATE: Sure.

MR. LATKER: I'm Norm Latker.

JUDGE PATE: We've had a chance to look at this case beforehand and think we're up to speed on the issues, and so we're ready to hear your arguments about patentability.

MR. LATKER: Okay. First, the applicant submits that none of the three cited patents, either alone or in combination, teach first and second straight-leg parts, which are 15 and 16 in the patent, of a striker parallel to each other with a front end of each connected together by a front connecting part 17; wherein the first straight-leg part has a front-side portion having a latch engaging part 32, engageable in a recess of a door latch 18, and a rear-side portion having a diameter 20 larger than that of the engaging part 32 of the front-side portion; wherein the rear-side portion is spaced apart from the plane of rotation of the latch 18; where in which plane the latch rotates to engage latch engaging part 32.

Clearly, both Ichinose and Hamada, which are assigned patents to the applicant, have all the structural features previously noted, with the exception of the claimed rear-side portion having a diameter larger than the diameter of a latch engaging part of a front-side portion which engages the latch.

JUDGE PATE: What's the purpose of making that part of the leg larger?

MR. LATKER: Pardon?

JUDGE PATE: What's the purpose of making that part of the leg larger?

1 MR. LATKER: To use it on heavier-duty automobiles that require a  
2 stronger striker than you would normally find in an automobile.

3 JUDGE PATE: Okay. Thank you.

4 MR. LATKER: Only the British patent to Mark may be argued to  
5 have both a front-side portion and a rear-side portion larger than that of the  
6 front-side portion. However, even conceding this, there is no teaching  
7 whatever in Mark of a front-side portion -- and that's the one with the  
8 smaller diameter -- being engageable by the Mark latch. The Mark latch is  
9 indicated to be engageable only with engageable portion 22, which is  
10 equivalent only to the claim front connecting part 17, which is the portion  
11 that is parallel to the plate of the striker.

12 JUDGE PATE: Does that even matter?

13 MR. LATKER: Pardon?

14 JUDGE PATE: Does it even matter what part of the striker is  
15 engaged?

16 MR. LATKER: Well, yes, from our point of view.

17 JUDGE PATE: Well, your claim is directed to a striker, per se. It  
18 says in the preamble it's directed to a striker.

19 MR. LATKER: Yes.

20 JUDGE PATE: So if I have a striker that you say --

21 MR. LATKER: No, I think that the latch is positively claimed, and  
22 the plane of its rotation is claimed in the claim.

23 JUDGE PATE: Yes, it's in the body of the claim, but the claim is  
24 directed to a striker. If the claim is directed to a striker, I don't care what  
25 latches that's going to engage it. What you're patenting is a U-shaped piece  
26 of metal with a base on it.

27 MR. LATKER: Well, I don't agree with that, on the basis of the  
28 positive recitation of the latch in the claim.

29 JUDGE PATE: That's just another structure that the striker is going  
30 to be used with.

31 MR. LATKER: Pardon?

32 JUDGE PATE: That's just a structure that the striker is going to be  
33 used with. Let's look at the preamble at 21.

34 (Pause.)

35 MR. LATKER: Sorry. Okay, I have claim one.

1 JUDGE PATE: Okay. So your argument is that that preamble is  
2 directed to a combination of a striker and a latch?

3 MR. LATKER: Well, a striker of a vehicle door latch device.

4 JUDGE PATE: Right. That part seems to indicate it's directed to a  
5 striker.

6 MR. LATKER: Well, it's a door latch --

7 JUDGE PATE: Just as the second page including a latch with the  
8 striker --

9 MR. LATKER: It's a door latch device.

10 JUDGE PATE: -- might argue that that makes it a combination. I  
11 could understand now.

12 JUDGE PATE: Okay. Well, that was the intention and that's why  
13 you have the positive recitation. We're back to discussing the Mark  
14 reference.

15 JUDGE PATE: Yes, go ahead.

16 MR. LATKER: Conceding, for the purpose of the discussion, that  
17 Mark teaches thickening of the legs of its striker, there's no teaching in Mark  
18 of the latch striking that leg. The Mark striker is designed so that the latch  
19 engages the parallel strut above the two legs.

20 Confirming that, on page 2, in the last two paragraphs of Mark, it  
21 indicates this: "Loop formation 16 comprises a pair of limbs 18-20 whose  
22 ends are riveted into spaced locations of base 12. The unitary loop  
23 formation also includes a medium latch bolt engaging portion 22," and that's  
24 the portion that's equivalent to applicant's parallel portion above the legs, "in  
25 the form of a straight crossbar lying in a plane parallel to but spaced from  
26 plate 12, and merging at each end a respective limb by a generally  
27 right-angled bend." And I'd like you to focus on the right-angled bend.

28 "The major part of each limb 18-20 extending from its riveted  
29 connection to base 12 almost to said right-angled bend is of substantially  
30 greater diameter than that of portion 22, including in this example the  
31 connecting bends merging with said major part." It's not exactly clear there  
32 as to what the diameter of the connecting bends is. It sounds like it's  
33 equivalent to the limbs, rather than the striking portion. However, Claim 8  
34 implies otherwise. And Claim 8 provides at least one limb is connected to  
35 the bolt engaging portion by a bent portion of the rod. The bent portion  
36 being of substantially the same cross-section as the bolt engaging portion.

1 Claim 8 makes clear that the Mark latch -- which isn't shown in the  
2 patent -- is limited to engagement with the latch engaging portion 22, and  
3 not with the unnumbered right-angled connecting bends which are indicated  
4 in the claim to have the same diameter of portion 22.

5 While the examiner may be justified in thickening the legs of either  
6 Ichinose and Hamada, on the basis of Mark, the applicant submits that there  
7 is no teaching whatever in Mark to thicken the legs of either Ichinose or  
8 Hamada below their right-angled connecting bends so as to produce the  
9 claimed latch engaging portion 32. Mark teaches only, at best, that the  
10 thickening of its limbs extends up to the Mark right-angled connecting  
11 bends, which are not identified as being a point able to engage the Mark  
12 latch; which seems to be correct in the sense that it is a bent portion and you  
13 would not normally connect a latch to a bent portion. Only bolt-engaging  
14 portion 22 is identified to serve that purpose.

15 The applicant further submits that even if it is agreed that Mark  
16 teaches engaging portion -- it's not 22; it's 32 -- the resulting structure still  
17 does not result in the claimed invention, for the reasons that applicant set out  
18 in its December 4, '06 reply brief. In the reply brief we indicated, even  
19 assuming that the examiner suggested prior art combination would be  
20 obvious -- which we don't admit -- the resulting structure still would not be  
21 equivalent to that claimed.

22 There is no teaching whatever in the cited prior art  
23 combination -- even if a rear-side portion of the first leg of 15A of Ichinose  
24 was modified to have a large diameter -- that the latch of Hamada would  
25 engage the front-side portion of the first leg above the rear-side portion  
26 having the large diameter, as claimed by applicant, rather than the rear-side  
27 portion. And of course, the claim is limited to the rotation plane of the latch  
28 being above the thickened portion of the leg. Hamada teaches only a latch  
29 engaging a leg of a striker which is perpendicular to the base of the striker  
30 and has the same diameter from end to end.

31 That's primarily our position on the case. We believe it's clear that  
32 Mark never intended that the end of the thickening portion on its legs would  
33 serve as a point to connect the latch. And the patent itself clearly indicates  
34 only that the engaging portion is the parallel portion of the striker to the  
35 base.

1 In our view, the examiner has used applicant's disclosure to reach the  
2 conclusion that he's reached because there's nothing in these patents that gets  
3 you to the result and the location of the striker as it relates to the two  
4 different diameters. And indeed, as I already indicated, in Mark the latch  
5 doesn't even hit the legs; it hits the crossbar.

6 If you have any questions, I'd be pleased to respond.

7 JUDGE FISCHETTI: My question that I have is Hamada, according  
8 to the examiner, is provided to teach that it is well known to have the latch  
9 member having legs that engage the part of the striker. That's all that is  
10 being used for, is the hole through the plate. So your commentary as to  
11 where the latch strikes really should be directed to Ichinose; which, and  
12 according to what I see, does show that a latch is connecting at one of the  
13 two depending portions of the U-connector.

14 MR. LATKER: Well, but Hamada doesn't teach the thickening of the  
15 leg. And once you thicken the Hamada leg, then the question becomes:  
16 Where are you going to locate the striker? To strike the thickened portion,  
17 or to strike the portion that has a smaller diameter? There's no teaching of  
18 that anywhere.

19 JUDGE FISCHETTI: My point is that it's the base reference Ichinose  
20 that is being modified, and it's Hamada that is being used just as a teaching  
21 reference to show that -- As a matter of fact, the examiner even gives almost  
22 an official notice for the same thing that Hamada is being used for. My  
23 point is, the argument should have been directed to Ichinose, the  
24 modifications that you're saying.

25 MR. LATKER: I think what I was trying to do in this response was  
26 indicate that we don't see much difference between Ichinose or Hamada.  
27 They both show strikers, and we're willing to concede that the striker hits  
28 one of the parallel legs. We're not arguing that point at all, if that's what  
29 you're saying.

30 JUDGE FISCHETTI: I wanted to just clear the argument --

31 MR. LATKER: We don't care which of the two patents he uses as his  
32 base reference.

33 JUDGE FISCHETTI: Well, I think we should follow what the  
34 examiner has laid out for us.

35 MR. LATKER: Pardon?

1 JUDGE FISCHETTI: We have to follow what the examiner has laid  
2 out for us.

3 MR. LATKER: Okay. Well, if I misspoke in here -- I indicated that  
4 both of them, from our point of view, were identical, and you can modify  
5 either one of them; which I think is responsive to the examiner's argument.  
6 We're just not making any distinction between the two strikers.

7 I would point out, we think that the examiner's reply brief and the  
8 final rejection never responded to our argument about the location of the  
9 rotation plane. You can't find that. He never responded to the argument. In  
10 fact, what I read to you basically went back to the original brief in which we  
11 pointed out that there's no teaching of the location of the plane of rotation of  
12 the latch in any of his arguments. He just says, "It's obvious -- You know,  
13 after I have decided to thicken a portion of it and create a thinner portion  
14 above it, the rest is obvious." We don't think it's obvious, especially when  
15 you look at Mark. Mark locates the latch in a totally different way.

16 JUDGE PATE: I think the examiner was saying that you're  
17 individually attacking the references, though. Everything you attack is  
18 Mark. Well, Mark is noted cited for 102. Mark is cited to teach that you can  
19 thicken the base legs of the U-shaped member. The other references teach  
20 about the latch.

21 MR. LATKER: I'm sorry, I don't follow your question.

22 JUDGE PATE: I don't really have a question. One other thing I  
23 wanted to ask you about was about the recent federal circuit case in Dystar,  
24 where they said, "For example, because it is stronger, cheaper, cleaner,  
25 faster, lighter, smaller, more durable, or more efficient --" The first one they  
26 mentioned is "stronger." It looks like to me that if you took Ichinose and  
27 said, "We need to make the legs stronger," you would thicken them, even  
28 without the reference to Mark.

29 MR. LATKER: Well, again, that leaves you with the second  
30 argument that we go back to. Even indicating that that case provides for the  
31 thickening, he still hasn't located the latch in the position that it's claimed.

32 JUDGE PATE: Okay. I understand your argument. Thank you, Mr.  
33 Latker. We don't have any more arguments, and we're going to take this  
34 case under advisement.

35 MR. LATKER: Right. Thank you.



Appeal 2007-2479  
Application 10/032,326

1 JUDGE PATE: Do you have a business card for the court reporter?  
2 A business card?

3 MR. LATKER: No. Sorry.

4 JUDGE FISCHETTI: We'll make sure she gets the right spelling of  
5 your name.

6 JUDGE PATE: Okay.

7 MR. LATKER: Thank you.

8 JUDGE PATE: Surely.

9 (Whereupon, at 1:13 p.m., the hearing was concluded.)